

**From:** Dan Schmeidler  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/24/02 1:09am  
**Subject:** Microsoft

I appreciate the opportunity to make a few comments that have been on my mind for quite some time. Let me first start off by saying that I have been a Macintosh user since their inception and I made that choice simply because after much research and investigation I concluded that (dos) was simply too complicated and confusing. So I invested what I considered to be a substantial sum of money in Macintosh hardware and software to run my small business. If that were the end of the story I probably wouldn't complain because that system ran our business flawlessly without a hitch and was very user friendly. However as technology progressed so did my interest in using the computer for other purposes other than running the business. Unfortunately I started to see software titles for Macintosh disappear, and software titles for Windows increase substantially. As time went on Microsoft's monopoly was apparent to me long before the complaint was filed by the DOJ. Software developers who originally developed software for the Macintosh began to withdraw their support for the older versions of software that I had and they discontinued any new future versions. But the last straw for me was while I was at the local CompUSA store. I asked the salesman who worked there why most of the software developers had stopped developing for the Mac. This particular gentleman happened to work part time at this computer store but his full time job was teaching computer classes on both Mac and Windows machines at the local high school. Although he admitted that he preferred the Mac OS over Windows, he simply said that a lot of the software developers have a no lose situation with Microsoft because they pay them to write exclusively for Windows. In other words he said, what would you do if I were to guarantee you a profit regardless of whether your software sells or not? I have personally talked to some of these software companies tech support personnel who pretty much confirmed what I had been told and quite frankly they were unapologetic as they dismissed my argument of fundamental fairness. My constant thought has always been that this can't be legal.

I'm just one person who has endured the frustration of the Microsoft strangle hold on the entire tech industry. I cannot say that I suffered the damage that some of these other companies have but I can say that I spent almost 2 decades at considerable expense and with constant frustration just to be able to exercise my freedom to use the OS platform that I choose.

Contrary to Microsoft's claims that innovation will be stifled if strong remedies are imposed, they are not and have not been an innovative force in the industry and in fact for the most part have pirated the innovations of others and used their monopoly power to crush those who dare challenge them.

I believe the complaint filed by the DOJ against Microsoft was necessary and legitimate. I believe the courts have ruled correctly when they

concluded that they engaged in illegal anticompetitive practices. I also believe that the penalty should be strict and substantial not only to punish Microsoft for the damage inflicted upon would be competitors, but to send a strong and clear message that Microsoft will not be allowed to dictate their will on the consumer, the technology industry, or the justice system from this time forth. I hope that the court will administer justice by placing maximum emphasis on doing what's right and fair to the minority consumer and companies whom the antitrust laws were supposedly designed to protect, rather than on Microsoft stockholders or others who may have a vested interest in Microsoft's success. From what I have read in some of the transcripts it is clear to me that Microsoft has proven to be untrustworthy and has seemingly attempted to use its monopoly power to impose its will on the courts by defying and ignoring the orders of the court. In my view a strong penalty imposed against Microsoft will ensure that if software developers desire to develop for multiple platforms they will have an equal financial incentive. It will also ensure that the different software titles for multiple platforms will be for the most part technologically equal and compatible, competitively priced, and released within a similar time frame. Innovation and affordable pricing come from competition not monopolies. It is in the best interest of the consumer, the tech industry, and of the justice system.

Thank You,

Dan Schmeidler  
1081 E 8175 S  
Sandy Utah  
801-561-5846